arXiv:math/0605422v2 [math.PR] 19 Sep 2006

Generalized 3G theorem and application to relativistic stable process on non-smooth open sets

Panki Kim
Department of Mathematics
Seoul National University
Seoul 151-742, Republic of Korea
Email: pkim@snu.ac.kr
Telephone number: 82-2-880-4077
Fax number: 82-2-887-4694
and
Young-Ran Lee
Department of Mathematics
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801, USA
Email:yrlee4@math.uiuc.edu
Telephone number: 1-217-265-6756
Fax number:1-217-333-9576

February 2, 2008

Abstract

Let $G(x,y)$ and $G_D(x,y)$ be the Green functions of rotationally invariant symmetric α-stable process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ and in an open set D respectively, where $0 < \alpha < 2$. The inequality $G_D(x,y)G_D(y,z)/G_D(x,z) \le c(G(x,y)+G(y,z))$ is a very useful tool in studying (local) Schrödinger operators. When the above inequality is true with $c = c(D) \in (0,\infty)$, then we say that the 3G theorem holds in D.

In this paper, we establish a generalized version of 3G theorem when D is a bounded κ-fat open set, which includes a bounded John domain. The 3G we consider is of the form $G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)/G_D(x,w)$, where y may be different from z. When $y = z$, we recover the usual 3G.

The 3G form $G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)/G_D(x,w)$ appears in non-local Schrödinger operator theory. Using our generalized 3G theorem, we give a concrete class of functions belonging to the non-local Kato class, introduced by Chen and Song, on κ-fat open sets.

As an application, we discuss relativistic α-stable processes (relativistic Hamiltonian when $\alpha = 1$) in κ-fat open sets. We identify the Martin boundary and the minimal Martin boundary with the Euclidean boundary for relativistic α-stable processes in κ-fat open sets. Furthermore, we show that relative Fatou type theorem is true for relativistic stable processes in κ-fat open sets.

The main results of this paper hold for a large class of symmetric Markov processes, as are illustrated in the last section of this paper. We also discuss the generalized 3G theorem for a large class of symmetric stable Lévy processes.

AMS 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 60J45, 60J75 ; Secondary: 31B25, 35J10

Keywords and phrases: 3G theorem, Generalized 3G theorem, Schrödinger operators, nonlocal Schrödinger operators, κ-fat open sets, symmetric stable process, Martin boundary, relative Fatou theorem, relativistic α-stable process, relativistic stable process, relativistic Hamiltonian, non-local Feynman-Kac perturbation, Feynman-Kac perturbation

1 Introduction

The 3G theorem is crucial to prove the conditional gauge theorem which says that the ratio of Green functions of the symmetric α-stable process with $0<\alpha\le 2$ and its local perturbation in the Kato class, $K_{d,\alpha}$, is either identically infinite or bounded above and below by two positive numbers. When $\alpha=2$, we have a Brownian motion. Here, the Kato class, $K_{d,\alpha},\ 0<\alpha\le 2,\ d\ge 2$, is the set of Borel functions q on $\mathbf{R}^d$ satisfying

$$\lim_{r\downarrow 0}\sup_{x\in\mathbf{R}^d}\int_{|x-y|\le r}\frac{|q(y)|}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}}dy=0.$$

For $d=\alpha=2$, $-\ln|x-y|$ replaces $|x-y|^{\alpha-d}$ (see [19]).

Cranston, Fabes and Zhao [19] proved the 3G theorem of the Brownian motion in a bounded Lipschitz domain $D\subset\mathbf{R}^d,\ d\ge 3$, saying that there exists a positive constant c depending only on D such that

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(y,z)}{G_D(x,z)}\le c\{|x-y|^{2-d}+|y-z|^{2-d}\},\qquad x,y,z\in D, \tag{1.1}$$

where G_D is the Green function of the Brownian motion in D. (1.1) was recently extended to bounded uniformly John domains, $D\subset\mathbf{R}^d,\ d\ge 3$, by Aikawa and Lundh [1] (see [2, 24, 36, 40] for $d=2$). The conditional gauge theorem for the Brownian motion is of great importance to study the Green function of the nonrelativistic Schrödinger operator with a local perturbation in D, $-\Delta+q(x)$, for q in the Kato class, $K_{d,2},\ d\ge 2$. Here, the free Hamiltonian, $-\Delta$, is related to the kinetic energy and q is its potential energy. The point of the negative sign in front of the Laplacian is to have that the spectrum of the free Hamiltonian is $[0,\infty)$.

For the symmetric α-stable process with $\alpha\in(0,2)$, the 3G theorem is also used to show the conditional gauge theorem. The infinitesimal generator of the symmetric α-stable process is the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ which is non-local (for example, see [15]). The 3G theorem for the symmetric α-stable process was first established and used by Chen and Song [15, 17] in a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain $D\subset\mathbf{R}^d,\ d\ge 2$. They prove that there exists a positive constant $c=c(D,\alpha)$ such that

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(y,z)}{G_D(x,z)}\le c\frac{|x-z|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|y-z|^{d-\alpha}},\qquad x,y,z\in D, \tag{1.2}$$

where G_D is the Green function of the symmetric α-stable process in D. Later, (1.2) was extended to a more general domain which is called a bounded κ-fat open set (a disconnected analogue of John domain, for the definition see Definition 2.3) by Song and Wu [38].

However, to prove the conditional gauge theorem of the symmetric α-stable process with a certain class (the non-local Kato class) of a non-local perturbation (for details, see section 4), we need to generalize the 3G theorem. It is the main objective of this paper to establish the inequality below.

Theorem 1.1 (the Generalized 3G theorem) *Suppose that D is a bounded κ-fat open set and that $G_D(x,y)$ is the Green function for the symmetric α-stable process in D with $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and $d \geq 2$. Then there exist positive constants $c = c(D,\alpha)$ and $\gamma < \alpha$ such that for every $x, y, z, w \in D$*

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \leq c\left(\frac{|x-w| \wedge |y-z|}{|x-y|} \vee 1\right)^{\gamma}\left(\frac{|x-w| \wedge |y-z|}{|z-w|} \vee 1\right)^{\gamma}\frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} \tag{1.3}$$

where $a \wedge b := \min\{a,b\}$, $a \vee b := \max\{a,b\}$, here and below.

The reason to call Theorem 1.1 the Generalized 3G theorem is that it plays the same role in non-local perturbations as the 3G theorem (1.2) in local perturbations, and that we recover the (classical) 3G theorem (1.2) by letting $y = z$ in (1.3). The inequality (1.3) is not true without the first two factors in the right-hand side of (1.3) (see Remark 3.19).

In order to describe why one needs the generalized 3G theorem, we introduce the measure $\mathbf{P}_x^w$ for the conditioned process obtained from killed process X^D (killed upon leaving D) through Doob's h-transform with $h(\cdot) = G_D(\cdot, w)$ (for details, see section 4 below) and use notations

$$G(x,y,z,w) := \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \quad \text{and} \quad G(x,z,w) := G(x,z,z,w).$$

When $\alpha = 2$, the (killed) symmetric α-stable process X^D in D is the Brownian motion with infinitesimal generator $-\Delta$ in D. For q in the Kato class, $K_{d,2}$, define a Schrödinger semigroup by

$$Q_t f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x\left[\exp\left(\int_0^t q(X_s^D)ds\right) f(X_t^D)\right], \quad t \geq 0,\, x \in D. \tag{1.4}$$

A major tool to prove the comparison (conditional gauge theorem) between Green functions, G_D and V_D, of $-\Delta$ and $-\Delta + q$, respectively, is 3G theorem and the identity

$$\mathbf{E}_x^w\left[\int_0^{\tau_D} q(X_s^D)ds\right] = \int_D G(x,z,w)q(z)dz, \quad (x,w) \in D \times D \tag{1.5}$$

(see page 191 in [18]). Then the conditional gauge theorem says that the comparison between Green functions is given by the form:

$$\frac{V_D(x,w)}{G_D(x,w)} = \mathbf{E}_x^w\left[\exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_D} q(X_s^D)ds\right)\right], \quad (x,w) \in D \times D$$

and the above is either identically infinite or bounded above and below by positive constants (see [18] for details).

On the other hand, for $\alpha \in (0,2)$, a symmetric α-stable process X^D in an open set D with infinitesimal generator $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ has discontinuous sample paths. So there is a large class of additive functionals of X^D which are not continuous. Additive functionals of the form

$$A_{q+F}(t) = \int_0^t q(X_s^D)ds + \sum_{s \leq t} F(X_{s-}^D, X_s^D)$$

constitute an important class of discontinuous additive functionals of X^D (for example, see [13]). Here q is a Borel-measurable function on D and F is some bounded Borel measurable function on $D \times D$ vanishing on the diagonal. As a generalization of (1.4), such an additive functional defines a Schrödinger (Feynman-Kac) semigroup by

$$T_t f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x \left[\exp\left(A_{q+F}(t) \right) f(X_t^D) \right], \quad t \geq 0,\, x \in D$$

having infinitesimal generator of the form

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x) \,+\, q(x) f(x) \,+\, \mathcal{A}(d,\, -\alpha) \int_D (e^{F(x,y)} - 1) f(y) |x-y|^{-d-\alpha} dy$$

where $\mathcal{A}(d,\, -\alpha)$ is a constant depending only on d and α (see Theorems 4.6, 4.8 and Corollary 4.9 in [13]). The Schrödinger operator of the above type has been studied in [8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 27]. In particular, Chen and Song [8, 13] introduced the various new Kato classes and proved conditional gauge theorems for a large class of Markov processes. The new non-local Kato class in [8, 13] is given in terms of $G(x,y,z,w)$. The counterpart of (1.5) is

$$\mathbf{E}_x^w \left[A_{q+F}(\tau_D) \right] \,=\, \int_D G(x,z,w) q(z) dz \,+\, \mathcal{A}(d,\, -\alpha) \int_D \int_D G(x,y,z,w) F(y,z) |y-z|^{-d-\alpha} dy dz.$$

So to give a concrete class of functions belonging to the non-local Kato class, it is necessary to derive some inequality to handle $G(x,y,z,w)$. In fact, if D is smooth, by Green function estimates (for example, see [9, 12, 15]), Chen and Song [13] give a sufficient condition for F to be in the new Kato class.

In this paper, we establish the inequality to deal with the generalized 3G form $G(x,y,z,w)$. Using this inequality, we show that the sufficient condition given in [13] works for any bounded κ-fat open set (see Theorem 4.3). An interesting thing on the exponent, γ, is that once we find a constant γ less than α, γ will not affect the concrete condition at all.

As an application of the concrete class of functions belonging to the non-local Kato class, we consider the relativistic α-stable process in a bounded κ-fat open set. When $\alpha = 1$, the infinitesimal generator of this process is the free relativistic Hamiltonian $\sqrt{-\Delta + m^2} - m$. Here the kinetic energy of a relativistic particle is $\sqrt{-\Delta + m^2} - m$, instead of $-\Delta$ for a nonrelativistic particle. The reason to subtract the constant m in the free Hamiltonian is to ensure that its spectrum is $[0, \infty)$ (see [7]). There exists a huge literature on the properties of relativistic Hamiltonian (for example, [7, 20, 22, 32, 33]). Recently relativistic α-stable process with the infinitesimal generator $(-\Delta + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m$ has been studied by Chen and Song [14], Kim [28], Kulczycki and Siudeja [31], Ryznar [35].

In this paper, we show that, in any bounded κ-fat open set, Green functions and Martin kernels of relativistic stable process are comparable to the ones of symmetric stable process. Using recent results in [11], we identify the Martin boundary and the minimal Martin boundary with the Euclidean boundary for relativistic α-stable process in κ-fat open set. In [28], the first named author studied the boundary behavior of the ratio of two harmonic functions of Schrödinger operators of the above type. As a consequence of the results in [28] and the generalized 3G inequality, we show that relative Fatou type theorem is true for the relativistic stable process in a κ-fat open set.

Our method works for other classes of symmetric Lévy processes. However to make the exposition as transparent as possible, we choose to present our results for (rotationally invariant) symmetric stable processes. Extensions to other classes of symmetric Lévy processes are mentioned at the end of the paper.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we collect basic definitions and properties of symmetric stable processes. Section 3 contains the proof of the generalized 3G theorem. In section 4, through the generalized 3G theorem, a concrete condition is given for functions to be in the non-local Kato class. Using the condition, the Martin boundary and the boundary behavior of harmonic functions for relativistic stable processes in bounded κ-fat open sets are studied. In section 5, some extensions of the main results of this paper to more general symmetric Markov processes are given. As an example, we show the generalized 3G theorem is true for some class of symmetric stable Lévy processes.

In this paper, we will use the following convention: The values of the constants C_0, C_1, M and ε_1 will remain the same throughout this paper, while the values of the constants $c, c_1, c_2, \cdots$ signify constants whose values are unimportant and which may change from location to location. In this paper, we use ":=" to denote a definition, which is read as "is defined to be". For any open set U, We denote by $\rho_U(x)$ the distance of a point x to the boundary of U, i.e., $\rho_U(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial U)$.

2 Preliminary

In this section, We recall the definition of a rotationally invariant symmetric stable process and collect its properties, which we will use later.

Let $X = \{X_t\}$ denote a (rotationally invariant) symmetric α-stable process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with $\alpha \in (0,\, 2)$ and $d \geq 2$, that is, let X_t be a Lévy process whose transition density $p(t, y-x)$ relative to the Lebesgue measure is given by the following Fourier transform,

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{ix\cdot\xi} p(t,x)dx = e^{-t|\xi|^\alpha}.$$

The Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}$ with the domain $\mathcal{F}$ associated with X is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(u,v) := \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{u}(\xi)\bar{\hat{v}}(\xi)|\xi|^\alpha d\xi, \quad \mathcal{F} := \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^d) : \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |\hat{u}(\xi)|^2|\xi|^\alpha d\xi < \infty\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\hat{u}(\xi) := (2\pi)^{-d/2}\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot y}u(y)dy$ (see Example 1.4.1 of [21]). As usual, we define $\mathcal{E}_1(u,v) := \mathcal{E}(u,v) + (u,v)_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)}$ for $u, v \in \mathcal{F}$. Another expression for $\mathcal{E}$ is as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)\int_{\mathbf{R}^d}\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \frac{(u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}}\, dxdy,$$

where $\mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha) := \alpha 2^{\alpha-1}\pi^{-d/2}\Gamma(\frac{d+\alpha}{2})\Gamma(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})^{-1}$. Here Γ is the Gamma function defined by $\Gamma(\lambda) := \int_0^\infty t^{\lambda-1}e^{-t}dt$ for every $\lambda > 0$. Let

$$J(x,y) := \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)|x-y|^{-(d+\alpha)}. \tag{2.2}$$

$J(x,y)dy$ is called the jumping measure of X. Let Cap be the 1-capacity associated with X (or equivalently, with the Riesz potential kernel $\mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}$). A function f is said to be quasi-continuous if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open set U such that $\mathrm{Cap}(U) < \varepsilon$ and $f|_{U^c}$ is continuous. It is known that every function f in $\mathcal{F}$ admits a quasi-continuous version. For concepts and results related to Dirichlet forms, we refer our readers to [21].

For any open set D, we use $\tau_D = \tau(D)$ to denote the first exit time of D, i.e., $\tau_D = \tau(D) = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \notin D\}$. Given an open set $D \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, let $X_t^D(\omega) = X_t(\omega)$ if $t < \tau_D(\omega)$ and set $X_t^D(\omega) = \partial$ if $t \geq \tau_D(\omega)$, where ∂ is a coffin state added to $\mathbf{R}^d$. The process X^D, i.e., the process X killed upon leaving D, is called the symmetric α-stable process in D. Throughout this paper, we use the convention $f(\partial) = 0$.

The Dirichlet form of X^D is $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}^D)$, where

$$\mathcal{F}^D := \{u \in \mathcal{F} : u = 0 \text{ on } D^c \text{ except for a set of zero capacity }\} \tag{2.3}$$

(cf. [21]). Thus for any $u, v \in \mathcal{F}^D$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u,v) = \int_D \int_D (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))J(x,y)dxdy + \int_D u(x)v(x)\kappa_D(x)dx, \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\kappa_D(x) := \mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)\int_{D^c} |x-y|^{-(d+\alpha)}dy. \tag{2.5}$$

Before we state more properties for a symmetric α-stable process, let's introduce the following definitions.

Definition 2.1 *Let D be an open subset of $\mathbf{R}^d$. A locally integrable function u defined on $\mathbf{R}^d$ taking values in $(-\infty, \infty]$ and satisfying the condition $\int_{\{x\in\mathbf{R}^d;|x|>1\}} |u(x)||x|^{-(d+\alpha)}dx < \infty$ is said to be*

(1) harmonic for X in D if

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left[|u(X_{\tau_B})|\right] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad u(x) = \mathbf{E}_x\left[u(X_{\tau_B})\right], \qquad x \in B,$$

for every open set B whose closure is a compact subset of D;

(2) regular harmonic for X in D if it is harmonic for X in D and for each $x \in D$,

$$u(x) = \mathbf{E}_x\left[u(X_{\tau_D})\right];$$

(3) singular harmonic for X in D if it is harmonic for X in D and it vanishes outside D.

Note that a harmonic function in an open set D is continuous in D (see [5] for an analytic definition and its equivalence). Also note that singular harmonic function u in D is harmonic with respect to X^D, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left[|u(X^D_{\tau_B})|\right] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad u(x) = \mathbf{E}_x\left[u(X^D_{\tau_B})\right], \qquad x \in B,$$

for every open set B whose closure is a compact subset of D.

We have the Harnack Principle as follows.

Theorem 2.2 *(Bogdan [3]) Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $r > 0$ such that $|x_1 - x_2| < Lr$. Then there exists a constant J depending only on d and α, such that*

$$J^{-1} L^{-(d+\alpha)} u(x_2) \le u(x_1) \le J L^{d+\alpha} u(x_2)$$

for every nonnegative harmonic function u in $B(x_1, r) \cup B(x_2, r)$.

Here and below, $B(x, r)$ denotes the ball centered at x with radius r.

We adopt the definition of a κ-fat open set from [38].

Definition 2.3 *Let $\kappa \in (0, 1/2]$. We say that an open set D in $\mathbf{R}^d$ is κ-fat if there exists $R > 0$ such that for each $Q \in \partial D$ and $r \in (0, R)$, $D \cap B(Q, r)$ contains a ball $B(A_r(Q), \kappa r)$ for some $A_r(Q) \in D$. The pair (R, κ) is called the characteristics of the κ-fat open set D.*

Note that every Lipschitz domain and *non-tangentially accessible domain* defined by Jerison and Kenig in [26] are κ-fat. Moreover, every *John domain* is κ-fat (see Lemma 6.3 in [34]). The boundary of a κ-fat open set can be highly nonrectifiable and, in general, no regularity of its boundary can be inferred. Bounded κ-fat open set can even be locally disconnected.

The boundary Harnack principle for κ-fat open sets was proved in [38].

Theorem 2.4 *(Theorem 3.1 in [38]) Let D be a κ-fat open set with (R, κ). Then there exists a constant $c = c(d, \alpha) > 1$ such that for any $Q \in \partial D$, $r \in (0, R)$ and functions $u, v \ge 0$ in $\mathbf{R}^d$, regular harmonic in $D \cap B(Q, 2r)$, vanishing on $D^c \cap B(Q, 2r)$, we have*

$$c^{-1} \kappa^{d+\alpha} \frac{u(A_r(Q))}{v(A_r(Q))} \le \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \le c \kappa^{-d-\alpha} \frac{u(A_r(Q))}{v(A_r(Q))}, \qquad x \in D \cap B\left(Q, \frac{r}{2}\right).$$

It is well known that there is a positive continuous symmetric function $G_D(x,y)$ on $(D\times D)\setminus\{x=y\}$ such that for any Borel measurable function $f\geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau_D} f(X_s)ds\right]=\int_D G_D(x,y)f(y)\,dy.$$

We set G_D equal to zero on the diagonal of $D\times D$ and outside $D\times D$. Function $G_D(x,y)$ is called the Green function of X^D, or the Green function of X in D. For any $x\in D$, $G_D(\,\cdot\,,x)$ is singular harmonic in $D\setminus\{x\}$ and regular harmonic in $D\setminus B(x,\varepsilon)$ for every $\varepsilon>0$. When $D=\mathbf{R}^d$, it is well known that $G_{\mathbf{R}^d}(x,y)=c|x-y|^{\alpha-d}$ where $c=c(d,\alpha)$ is a positive constant depending only on d and α.

3 Generalized 3G theorem

In this section, we prove the objective of this paper, the generalized 3G theorem 1.1, in a bounded κ-fat open set D. Let D be a κ-fat open set with its characteristics (R,κ), $0<\kappa\leq 1/2$. We fix R and κ throughout this section. We collect and prove lemmas to prove the main theorem.

For any ball B in $\mathbf{R}^d$ let $P_B(x,z)$ be the Poisson kernel for X in B, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}_x(X_{\tau_B}\in A)=\int_A P_B(x,z)dz,\quad A\subset\mathbf{R}^d\setminus B.$$

It is well-known that

$$P_{B(x_0,r)}(x,z)\;=\;c_1\,\frac{(r^2-|x-x_0|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{(|z-x_0|^2-r^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}\,\frac{1}{|x-z|^d}\tag{3.1}$$

for some constant $c_1=c_1(d,\alpha)>0$.

The next lemma can be proved easily using (3.1) (see [3, 29, 38]). Since knowing the value of γ might be interesting for readers, we put a proof here. Moreover, with an eye towards the extensions in section 5, the following lemma will be proved without using (3.1). Instead, we will use the fact that

$$P_{B(x,1)}(x,z)\;\geq\;c(d,\alpha)\,|x-z|^{-d-\alpha},\quad z\in\mathbf{R}^d\setminus\overline{B(x,1)},\;x\in\mathbf{R}^d.\tag{3.2}$$

Recall, from Definition 2.3 that, for $Q\in\partial D$ and $r\in(0,R)$, there exists a point $A_r(Q)$ in $D\cap B(Q,r)$ such that $B(A_r(Q),\kappa r)\subset D\cap B(Q,r)$. Recall $\rho_D(x)=\text{dist}(x,\partial D)$. Note that $\kappa R\leq\rho_D(A_r(Q))<r$.

Lemma 3.1 *(Lemma 5 of [3] and Lemma 3.6 of [38]) There exist positive constants $c=c(d,\alpha,\kappa)$ and $\gamma=\gamma(d,\alpha,\kappa)<\alpha$ such that for all $Q\in\partial D$ and $r\in(0,R)$, and function $u\geq 0$, harmonic in $D\cap B(Q,r)$, we have*

$$u(A_s(Q))\geq c(s/r)^\gamma u(A_r(Q)),\qquad s\in(0,r).\tag{3.3}$$

In fact, there exists a small constant $c_1=c_1(d,\alpha)>0$ so that we can take $\gamma=\alpha-c_1(\ln(2/\kappa))^{-1}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume $r = 1$, $Q = 0$ and $u(A_r(Q)) = 1$. Let $r_k := (\kappa/2)^k$, $A_k := A_{r_k}(0)$ and $B_k := B(A_k, r_{k+1})$ for $k = 0, 1, \cdots$.

Note that the B_k's are disjoint. So by the harmonicity of u, we have

$$u(A_k) \,\geq\, \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{E}_{A_k}\left[u(X_{\tau_{B_k}}) :\, X_{\tau_{B_k}} \in B_l\right] \,=\, \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \int_{B_l} P_{B_k}(A_k, z) u(z) dz.$$

Since $B_k \subset B(A_k, 2r_{k+1}) \subset D \cap B(0, r_k)$, The Harnack principle (Theorem 2.2) implies that

$$\int_{B_l} P_{B_k}(A_k, z) u(z) dz \,\geq\, c_1\, u(A_l) \int_{B_l} P_{B_k}(A_k, z) dz \,=\, c_1\, u(A_l)\, \mathbf{P}_{A_k}(X_{\tau_{B_k}} \in B_l)$$

for some constant $c_1 = c_1(d, \alpha)$. By the scaling property of X, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{A_k}(X_{\tau_{B_k}} \in B_l) \,&=\, \mathbf{P}_{r_{k+1}^{-1} A_k}(X_{\tau(r_{k+1}^{-1} B_k)} \in r_{k+1}^{-1} B_l) \\ &\geq\, c\,(r_{k-l})^{-d} \left(\rho_{r_{k+1}^{-1} B_l}(r_{k+1}^{-1} A_k)\right)^{-d-\alpha} \,\geq\, c_2\, r_{k-l}^{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_2 = c_2(d, \alpha)$. In the first and second inequalities above, we have used (3.2) and the fact that $\rho_{B_l}(A_k) \leq 2r_l$ respectively. Therefore,

$$(r_k)^{-\alpha}\, u(A_k) \,\geq\, c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (r_l)^{-\alpha}\, u(A_l)$$

for some constant $c_3 = c_3(d, \alpha)$. Let $a_k := r_k^{-\alpha} u(A_k)$ so that $a_k \geq c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} a_l$. By induction, one can easily check that $a_k \geq c_4 (1 + c_3/2)^k$ for some constant $c_4 = c_4(d, \alpha)$. Thus, with $\gamma = \alpha - \ln(1 + \frac{c_3}{2})(\ln(2/\kappa))^{-1}$, (3.3) is true for $s = r_k$. For the other values, use Harnack principle (Theorem 2.2). □

The fact, $\gamma < \alpha$, is critical in the next section. As a corollary of the boundary Harnack principle (Theorem 2.4), we immediately get the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.2 *There exists a constant $c = c(D, \alpha) > 1$ such that for every $Q \in \partial D$, $0 < r < R$, we have*

$$\frac{G_D(x, z_1)}{G_D(y, z_1)} \,\leq\, c\, \frac{G_D(x, z_2)}{G_D(y, z_2)}, \tag{3.4}$$

when $x, y \in D \setminus \overline{B(Q, r)}$ and $z_1, z_2 \in D \cap B(Q, r/4)$.

Let $M := 2\kappa^{-1}$ and fix $z_0 \in D$ with $2R/M < \rho_D(z_0) < R$ and let $\varepsilon_1 := R/(12M)$. For $x, y \in D$, we define $r(x, y) := \rho_D(x) \vee \rho_D(y) \vee |x - y|$ and

$$\mathcal{B}(x, y) := \left\{ A \in D :\, \rho_D(A) > \frac{1}{M} r(x, y),\, |x - A| \vee |y - A| < 5r(x, y) \right\}$$

if $r(x,y) < \varepsilon_1$, and $\mathcal{B}(x,y) := \{z_0\}$ otherwise.

By the monotonicity of the Green function and the formula for the Green function for balls (for example, see [15]), there exists a positive constant C_0 such that

$$G_D(x,y) \le C_0|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}, \qquad x,y \in D \tag{3.5}$$

and that $G_D(x,y) \ge G_{B(y,\rho_D(y))}(x,y) \ge C_0^{-1}|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}$ if $|x-y| \le \rho_D(y)/2$. Let $C_1 := C_0 2^{d-\alpha}\rho_D(z_0)^{-d+\alpha}$ so that $G_D(\cdot,z_0)$ is bounded above by C_1 on $D \setminus B(z_0,\rho_D(z_0)/2)$. Now we define

$$g(x) := G_D(x,z_0) \wedge C_1.$$

Note that if $\rho_D(z) \le 6\varepsilon_1$, then $|z-z_0| \ge \rho_D(z_0) - 6\varepsilon_1 \ge \rho_D(z_0)/2$ since $6\varepsilon_1 < \rho_D(z_0)/4$, and therefore $g(z) = G_D(z,z_0)$.

The lemma below immediately follows from the Harnack principle, Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 3.3 *There exists $c = c(D,\alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x,y \in D$,*

$$c^{-1}\, g(A_1) \le g(A_2) \le c\, g(A_1), \qquad A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}(x,y).$$

Using the Harnack principle and the boundary Harnack principle, the following form of Green function estimates has been established by several authors. (See Theorem 2.4 in [22] and Theorem 1 in [25]. Also see [10] for a different jump process and see [30] for non-symmetric diffusion.)

Theorem 3.4 *There exists $c = c(D,\alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x,y \in D$*

$$c^{-1}\,\frac{g(x)g(y)}{g(A)^2}\,|x-y|^{-d+\alpha} \le G_D(x,y) \le c\,\frac{g(x)g(y)}{g(A)^2}\,|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(x,y). \tag{3.6}$$

Applying Theorem 3.4, we immediately get the following inequality.

Theorem 3.5 *There exists a constant $c = c(D,\alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x,y,z,w \in D$ and $(A_{x,y}, A_{z,w}, A_{x,w}) \in \mathcal{B}(x,y) \times \mathcal{B}(z,w) \times \mathcal{B}(x,w)$,*

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \le c\,\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{x,w})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2 g(A_{z,w})^2}\,\frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}. \tag{3.7}$$

Using the Harnack principle, the proof of the next lemma is well-known (for example, see Lemma 6.7 in [18]). We skip the proof.

Lemma 3.6 *(Lemma 2.2 in [22]) For every $c_1 > 0$, there exists $c = c(D,\alpha,c_1) > 0$ such that for every $|x-y| \le c_1(\rho_D(x) \wedge \rho_D(y))$, $G_D(x,y) \ge c|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}$.*

The following lemma is a direct application of Lemma 3.4 in [38] and Lemma 4 in [3]. However, for the extensions in section 5, we prove here using Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.7 *(Carleson's estimate) There exists a constant* $c = c(D, \alpha) > 1$ *such that for every* $Q \in \partial D$, $0 < r < \kappa R/4$, $y \in D \setminus \overline{B(Q, 4r)}$

$$G_D(x, y) \le c\, G_D(A_r(Q), y), \quad x \in D \cap B(Q, r). \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, there exists a constant $c = c(D, \alpha) > 1$ such that for every $Q \in \partial D$, $0 < r < \kappa R/4$, we have

$$\frac{G_D(x, y)}{G_D(A_r(Q), y)} \le c \frac{G_D(x, z)}{G_D(A_r(Q), z)}$$

for any $x \in D \cap B(Q, r)$ and $y,\ z \in D \setminus \overline{B(Q, 4r)}$. Since $r < \kappa R/4$, i.e., $4r/\kappa < R$, we can and do pick $z = A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)$. Then by (3.6) and the inequality (3.5), there exists a positive constant $c_1 = c_1(D, \alpha)$ such that

$$\frac{G_D(x, A_{4r/\kappa}(Q))}{G_D(A_r(Q), A_{4r/\kappa}(Q))} < c_1,$$

which immediately implies the inequality (3.8). Indeed, by (3.5),

$$G_D(x, A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)) \le C_0\, |x - A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)|^{-d+\alpha} \le c_2\, r^{-d+\alpha}$$

since $|x - A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)| \ge \rho_D(A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)) - \rho_D(x) \ge 4r - r = 3r$. On the other hand, since

$$|A_r(Q) - A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)| \le \frac{8r}{\kappa} \le \frac{8}{\kappa^2}(\rho_D(A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)) \wedge \rho_D(A_r(Q))),$$

by Lemma 3.6, we obtain

$$G_D(A_{4r/\kappa}(Q), A_r(Q)) \ge c_3\, |A_r(Q) - A_{4r/\kappa}(Q)|^{-d+\alpha} \ge c_3\, r^{-d+\alpha}.$$

□

For every $x, y \in D$, we denote Q_x and Q_y be points on ∂D such that $\rho_D(x) = |x - Q_x|$ and $\rho_D(y) = |y - Q_y|$ respectively. It is easy to check that if $r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$

$$A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x),\ A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y) \in \mathcal{B}(x, y). \tag{3.9}$$

In fact, by definition of $A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)$, $\rho_D(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)) \ge \kappa r(x, y) > r(x, y)/M$. Moreover,

$$|x - A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)| \le |x - Q_x| + |Q_x - A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)| \le \rho_D(x) + r(x, y) \le 2r(x, y)$$

and $|y - A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)| \le |y - x| + |x - A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)| \le 3r(x, y)$. Thus we get (3.9).

Recall the fact that $g(z) = G_D(z, z_0)$ if $\rho_D(z) < 6\varepsilon_1$.

Lemma 3.8 *There exists $c = c(D, \alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x, y \in D$ with $r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$,*

$$g(z) \le c\, g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)), \quad z \in D \cap B(Q_x, r(x, y)) \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. Note that for $z \in D \cap B(Q_x, 2r(x, y))$, $\rho_D(z) < 2\varepsilon_1$. Thus $g(\cdot) = G_D(\cdot, z_0)$ in $D \cap B(Q_x, 2r(x, y))$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $g(z) = G_D(z, z_0) \le c\, G_D(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x), z_0) = c\, g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x))$ for $z \in D \cap B(Q_x, r(x, y))$. □

Lemma 3.9 *There exists $c = c(D, \alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x, y \in D$*

$$g(x) \vee g(y) \le c\, g(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(x, y).$$

Proof. If $r(x, y) \ge \varepsilon_1$, then $\mathcal{B}(x, y) = \{z_0\}$ and $g(x) \vee g(y) \le C_1 = g(z_0)$.

Now assume $r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$. Since $\rho_D(x) \le r(x, y)$, $x \in D \cap B(Q_x, r(x, y))$. Thus, by Lemma 3.8,

$$g(x) \le c\, g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)).$$

Similarly, we obtain $g(y) \le c\, g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y))$.

The lemma follows from Lemma 3.3 and (3.9). □

Lemma 3.10 *If $x, y, z \in D$ satisfy $r(x, z) \le r(y, z)$, then there exists $c = c(D, \alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$g(A_{x,y}) \le c\, g(A_{y,z}) \qquad \text{for every } (A_{x,y}, A_{y,z}) \in \mathcal{B}(x, y) \times \mathcal{B}(y, z).$$

Proof. If $r(y, z) \ge \varepsilon_1$, then $g(A_{y,z}) = C_1 \ge g(A_{x,y})$. Thus, we assume $r(y, z) < \varepsilon_1$. First, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} r(x, y) &\le \rho_D(x) \vee \rho_D(y) \vee (|x - z| + |z - y|) \\ &\le \rho_D(x) \vee \rho_D(y) \vee |x - z| + \rho_D(x) \vee \rho_D(y) \vee |z - y| \le 2(r(x, z) + r(y, z)) \le 4\, r(y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the assumption $r(x, z) \le r(y, z)$ was used in the last inequality. So $A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y) \in D \cap B(Q_y, 4r(y, z))$. Since $g(\cdot) = G_D(\cdot, z_0)$ in $D \cap B(Q_y, 6r(y, z))$ and $6r(y, z) < \kappa R/4$, by Lemma 3.7,

$$g(w) = G_D(w, z_0) \le c G_D(A_{6r(y,z)}(Q_y), z_0) = c g(A_{6r(y,z)}(Q_y))$$

for $w \in D \cap B(Q_y, 6r(y, z))$. Here, we used $|Q_y - z_0| \ge \rho_D(z_0) > 2R/M > 24r(y, z)$. In particular, with $w = A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y)$,

$$g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y)) \le c g(A_{6r(y,z)}(Q_y)).$$

By Theorem 2.2, $g(A_{6r(y,z)}(Q_y)) = G_D(A_{6r(y,z)}(Q_y), z_0) \le c_1 G_D(A_{r(y,z)}(Q_y), z_0) = c_1 g(A_{r(y,z)}(Q_y))$ for some $c_1 = c_1(d, \alpha)$. Thus

$$g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y)) \le c_2\, g(A_{r(y,z)}(Q_y))$$

for some $c_2 = c_2(D, \alpha)$. Using (3.9) we apply Lemma 3.3 both sides of the above functions and we have proved the lemma. □

Lemma 3.11 *There exists* $c = c(D, \alpha) > 0$ *such that for every* $x, y, z, w \in D$ *and* $(A_{x,y}, A_{y,z}, A_{z,w}, A_{x,w}) \in \mathcal{B}(x, y) \times \mathcal{B}(y, z) \times \mathcal{B}(z, w) \times \mathcal{B}(x, w)$,

$$g(A_{x,w})^2 \;\le\; c\, \left(g(A_{x,y})^2 + g(A_{y,z})^2 + g(A_{z,w})^2 \right). \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 3.10 to both cases $r(x, y) \le r(y, z)$ and $r(x, y) \ge r(y, z)$, we get

$$g(A_{x,z})^2 \;\le\; c_1 \left(g(A_{x,y})^2 \;+\; g(A_{y,z})^2 \right).$$

Obviously, using the above inequality twice, we get

$$g(A_{x,w})^2 \;\le\; c_1 \left(g(A_{x,z})^2 \;+\; g(A_{z,w})^2 \right) \;\le\; c_1 \left(c_1 g(A_{x,y})^2 + c_1 g(A_{y,z})^2 + g(A_{z,w})^2 \right).$$

□

Recall γ from Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.12 *There exists* $c = c(D, \alpha) > 0$ *such that for every* $x, y \in D$ *with* $r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$,

$$g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)) \wedge g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y)) \;\ge\; c\, r(x, y)^{\gamma}.$$

Proof. By symmetry, we show for $A = A_{r(x,y)}(Q_x)$ only. Note that $g(\cdot) = G_D(\cdot, z_0)$ is harmonic in $D \cap B(Q_x, 2\varepsilon_1)$. Since $r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$, by Lemma 3.1 (recall $\varepsilon_1 = R/(12M)$),

$$g(A) = G_D(A, z_0) \;\ge\; c \left(\frac{r(x, y)}{2\varepsilon_1} \right)^{\gamma} G_D(A_{2\varepsilon_1}(Q_x), z_0).$$

Note that $\rho_D(z_0) \ge R/M = 12\varepsilon_1$ and $\rho_D(A_{2\varepsilon_1}(Q_x)) > 2\varepsilon_1/M$. Thus by Lemma 3.6, $G_D(A_{2\varepsilon_1}(Q_x), z_0) > c_1 > 0$. □

Lemma 3.13 *There exists* $c = c(D, \alpha) > 0$ *such that for every* $x, y, z \in D$ *and* $(A_{x,y}, A_{y,z}) \in \mathcal{B}(x, y) \times \mathcal{B}(y, z)$

$$\frac{g(A_{y,z})}{g(A_{x,y})} \;\le\; c \left(\frac{r(y, z)^{\gamma}}{r(x, y)^{\gamma}} \vee 1 \right).$$

Proof. Note that if $r(x, y) \ge \varepsilon_1$, $g(A_{y,z}) \le C_1 = g(A_{x,y})$. So three cases will be considered:

a) $r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$ and $r(y, z) \ge \varepsilon_1$: By Lemma 3.12, we have

$$\frac{g(A_{y,z})}{g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y))} \;\le\; c\, \frac{C_1}{r(x, y)^{\gamma}} \;\le\; c\, C_1 \varepsilon_1^{-\gamma} \frac{r(y, z)^{\gamma}}{r(x, y)^{\gamma}}.$$

b) $r(y, z) \le r(x, y) < \varepsilon_1$: Then $A_{r(y,z)}(Q_y) \in D \cap B(Q_y, r(x, y))$. Thus by Lemma 3.7, $g(A_{r(y,z)}(Q_y)) \le c g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y)))$.

c) $r(x,y) < r(y,z) < \varepsilon_1$: By Lemma 3.1,

$$\frac{g(A_{r(y,z)}(Q_y))}{g(A_{r(x,y)}(Q_y))} \le c\,\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(x,y)^\gamma}.$$

In all three cases, we apply Lemma 3.3 and we have proved the lemma. □

Lemma 3.14 *There exists a constant $c = c(D,\alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x,y,z,w \in D$ and $(A_{x,y}, A_{z,w}, A_{x,w}) \in \mathcal{B}(x,y) \times \mathcal{B}(z,w) \times \mathcal{B}(x,w)$,*

$$\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{x,w})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2 g(A_{z,w})^2} \le c\left(\frac{r(x,w)}{r(x,y)} \vee 1\right)^\gamma \left(\frac{r(x,w)}{r(z,w)} \vee 1\right)^\gamma.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{x,w})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2 g(A_{z,w})^2} = \frac{g(y)g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})g(A_{z,w})}\left(\frac{g(A_{x,w})}{g(A_{x,y})}\right)\left(\frac{g(A_{x,w})}{g(A_{z,w})}\right).$$

By Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\frac{g(y)g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})g(A_{z,w})} \le c.$$

On the other hand, applying Lemma 3.13 gives

$$\left(\frac{g(A_{x,w})}{g(A_{x,y})}\right)\left(\frac{g(A_{x,w})}{g(A_{z,w})}\right) \le c\left(\frac{r(x,w)}{r(x,y)} \vee 1\right)^\gamma \left(\frac{r(x,w)}{r(z,w)} \vee 1\right)^\gamma.$$

□

Lemma 3.15 *For every $a,b,c > 0$, we have*

$$\left(\frac{a}{b} \vee 1\right) + \left(\frac{a}{c} \vee 1\right) \le 2\left(\frac{a}{b} \vee 1\right)\left(\frac{a}{c} \vee 1\right).$$

Proof. By considering each case, it is clear. So we omit details. □

Lemma 3.16 *There exists a constant $c = c(D,\alpha) > 0$ such that for every $x,y,z,w \in D$ and $(A_{x,y}, A_{z,w}, A_{x,w}) \in \mathcal{B}(x,y) \times \mathcal{B}(z,w) \times \mathcal{B}(x,w)$,*

$$\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{x,w})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2 g(A_{z,w})^2} \le c\left(\frac{r(y,z)}{r(x,y)} \vee 1\right)^\gamma \left(\frac{r(y,z)}{r(z,w)} \vee 1\right)^\gamma.$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.11, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{x,w})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2g(A_{z,w})^2} &\le c\,\frac{g(y)g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})^2g(A_{z,w})^2}(g(A_{x,y})^2+g(A_{y,z})^2+g(A_{z,w})^2)\\ &= c\left(\frac{g(y)g(z)}{g(A_{z,w})^2}+\frac{g(y)g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})^2}+\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{y,z})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2g(A_{z,w})^2}\right). \qquad (3.12)\end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 3.9 to both y and z, we have that $g(y)\le cg(A_{x,y})$ and $g(z)\le cg(A_{z,w})$. Thus (3.12) is less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&c\frac{g(y)}{g(A_{z,w})}+c\frac{g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})}+c^2\left(\frac{g(A_{y,z})}{g(A_{x,y})}\right)\left(\frac{g(A_{y,z})}{g(A_{z,w})}\right)\\ &\le c\frac{g(y)}{g(A_{z,w})}+c\frac{g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})}+c_1\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(x,y)^\gamma}\vee 1\right)\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(z,w)^\gamma}\vee 1\right).\end{aligned}$$

We have used Lemma 3.13 in the last inequality above. Moreover, by Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.13,

$$\frac{g(y)}{g(A_{z,w})}=\left(\frac{g(y)}{g(A_{y,z})}\right)\left(\frac{g(A_{y,z})}{g(A_{z,w})}\right)\le c\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(z,w)^\gamma}\vee 1\right)$$

and

$$\frac{g(z)}{g(A_{x,y})}=\left(\frac{g(z)}{g(A_{y,z})}\right)\left(\frac{g(A_{y,z})}{g(A_{x,y})}\right)\le c\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(x,y)^\gamma}\vee 1\right).$$

We conclude that (3.12) is less than or equal to

$$c_2\left(\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(x,y)^\gamma}\vee 1\right)+\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(z,w)^\gamma}\vee 1\right)+\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(x,y)^\gamma}\vee 1\right)\left(\frac{r(y,z)^\gamma}{r(z,w)^\gamma}\vee 1\right)\right)$$

for some $c_2=c_2(D,\alpha)>0$. Using Lemma 3.15, we have finished the proof. □

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this paper.

Proof of **Theorem** 1.1. Let

$$G(x,y,z,w) := \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \quad\text{and}\quad H(x,y,z,w) := \frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}.$$

1. If $|x-w|\le\rho_D(x)\wedge\rho_D(w)$, by Lemma 3.6, $G_D(x,w)\ge c|x-w|^{-d+\alpha}$. Thus we have $G(x,y,z,w)\le cH(x,y,z,w)$.

2. If $|y-z|\le\rho_D(y)\wedge\rho_D(z)$, then by Lemma 3.6 $G_D(y,z)\ge c|y-z|^{-d+\alpha}$. Moreover, from the classical 3G theorem (Theorem 6.1 in [38]), we obtain that there exists a constant $c=c(D,\alpha)>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}G(x,y,z,w) &= \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(y,z)}{G_D(x,z)}\frac{G_D(x,z)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)}\frac{1}{G_D(y,z)}\\ &\le c\,\frac{|x-z|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|y-z|^{d-\alpha}}\frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-z|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}\frac{1}{G_D(y,z)}\\ &= c\,\frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|y-z|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}\frac{1}{G_D(y,z)}. \qquad (3.13)\end{aligned}$$

   Thus, we have $G(x,y,z,w)\le cH(x,y,z,w)$.

3. Now we assume that $|x-w| > \rho_D(x) \wedge \rho_D(w)$ and $|y-z| > \rho_D(y) \wedge \rho_D(z)$. Since $\rho_D(x) \vee \rho_D(w) \le \rho_D(x) \wedge \rho_D(w) + |x-w|$, using the assumption $\rho_D(x) \wedge \rho_D(w) < |x-w|$, we obtain $r(x,w) < 2|x-w|$. Similarly, $r(y,z) < 2|y-z|$.

   Let $A_{x,w} \in \mathcal{B}(x,w)$, $A_{x,y} \in \mathcal{B}(x,y)$ and $A_{z,w} \in \mathcal{B}(z,w)$. Applying Lemmas 3.14 and 3.16 to (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(x,y,z,w) &\le c\,\frac{g(y)g(z)g(A_{x,w})^2}{g(A_{x,y})^2 g(A_{z,w})^2} H(x,y,z,w) \\ &\le c\left(\frac{r(y,z)\wedge r(x,w)}{r(x,y)} \vee 1\right)^{\gamma} \left(\frac{r(y,z)\wedge r(x,w)}{r(z,w)} \vee 1\right)^{\gamma} H(x,y,z,w). \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

   Now applying the fact that $r(x,w) < 2|x-w|$, $r(y,z) < 2|y-z|$, $r(x,y) \ge |x-y|$ and $r(z,w) \ge |z-w|$, we have (1.3).

We have proved the theorem. □

Remark 3.17 By letting $y = z$ in (1.3), we recover the classical 3G theorem, i.e.,

$$\frac{G_D(x,z)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \le c\,\frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-z|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} \le c_1\left(\frac{1}{|x-z|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}\right).$$

Remark 3.18 See (3.2)-(3.3) in [13] for a generalized version of 3G-estimate on bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains. Using Green function estimates in [15], instead of Lemma 3.1, it is easy to see that $\gamma = \alpha/2$ in (1.3) for bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains.

Remark 3.19 The inequality in (1.3) is not true even in smooth domains without the first two factors in the right-hand side of (1.3); If D is smooth, by Green function estimate (for example, see [15]), there exists a positive constant $c = c(D,\alpha)$ such that

$$c\left(\frac{\rho_D(y)\rho_D(z)|x-w|^2}{r(x,y)^2 r(z,w)^2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} \le \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)}. \tag{3.15}$$

Suppose the inequality in (1.3) is true without the factors. Then (3.15) implies that there exists a positive constant $c_1 = c_1(D,\alpha)$ such that for distinct x,y,z,w in D

$$\frac{\rho_D(y)\rho_D(z)|x-w|^2}{r(x,y)^2 r(z,w)^2} \le c_1. \tag{3.16}$$

But (3.16) can not be true. In fact, for points $x \ne w \in D$ near ∂D, choose $y \ne z$ such that $x \ne y$, $z \ne w$, $r(x,y) = \rho_D(x) = \rho_D(y) \ge |x-y|$ and $r(z,w) = \rho_D(z) = \rho_D(w) \ge |z-w|$. Then,

$$\frac{\rho_D(y)\rho_D(z)|x-w|^2}{r(x,y)^2 r(z,w)^2} = \frac{|x-w|^2}{\rho_D(x)\rho_D(w)} \to \infty \quad \text{as } x \to \partial D.$$

4 Concrete sufficient conditions for the non-local Kato class and relativistic stable process

Throughout this section D is a bounded κ-fat open set. In this section, we recall the new (non-local) Kato class introduced by Chen and Song ([8, 16, 13]). Then we apply the generalized 3G theorem to establish some concrete sufficient condition for functions to be in the non-local Kato class. Using this sufficient condition, we discuss some properties of relativistic stable process in bounded κ-fat open sets.

We will use the definitions for the new Kato class not only for symmetric stable process, but also for other symmetric Hunt processes, which will be specified later. So we will denote Y for those processes in D, $G(x,y)$ for the Green function for Y and will state the following definition for Y. Note that the processes in this paper are irreducible transient symmetric Hunt processes satisfying the assumption at the beginning of section 3.2 in [8].

We call a positive measure μ on D a smooth measure of Y if there is a positive continuous additive functional (PCAF in abbreviation) A of Y such that

$$\int_D f(x)\mu(dx) = \uparrow \lim_{t\downarrow 0} \int_D \mathbf{E}_x\left[\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t f(Y_s)dA_s\right]dx \tag{4.1}$$

for any Borel measurable function $f \geq 0$. Here $\uparrow \lim_{t\downarrow 0}$ means the quantity is increasing as $t \downarrow 0$. The measure μ is called the Revuz measure of A. For a signed measure μ, we use μ^+ and μ^- to denote its positive and negative parts respectively. If $\mu^+$and μ^- are smooth measures of Y and A^+ and A^- are their corresponding PCAFs of Y, then we say the continuous additive functional $A := A^+ - A^-$ of Y has (signed) Revuz measure μ.

Definition 4.1 *Suppose that A is a continuous additive functional of Y with Revuz measure ν. Let A^+ and A^- be the PCAFs (positive continuous additive functionals) of Y with Revuz measures ν^+ and ν^- respectively. Let $|A| = A^+ + A^-$ and $|\nu| = \nu^+ + \nu^-$.*

(1) The measure ν (or the continuous additive functional A) is said to be in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty(Y)$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are a Borel subset $K = K(\varepsilon)$ of finite $|\nu|$-measure and a constant $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(x,z)\in(D\times D)\setminus\{x=z\}} \int_{D\setminus K} \frac{G(x,y)G(y,z)}{G(x,z)} |\nu|(dy) \leq \varepsilon$$

and that, for all measurable set $B \subset K$ with $|\nu|(B) < \delta$,

$$\sup_{(x,z)\in(D\times D)\setminus\{x=z\}} \int_{B} \frac{G(x,y)G(y,z)}{G(x,z)} |\nu|(dy) \leq \varepsilon.$$

(2) A function q is said to be in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty(Y)$, if $\nu(dx) := q(x)dx$ is in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty(Y)$.

Let (N, H) be a Lévy system for Y in D, that is, for every $x \in D$, $N(x, dy)$ is a kernel on $(D_\partial, \mathcal{B}(D_\partial))$, where ∂ is the cemetery point for process Y and $D_\partial = D \cup \{\partial\}$, and H_t is a positive continuous additive functional of Y with bounded 1-potential such that for any nonnegative Borel function f on $D \times D_\partial$ that vanishes along the diagonal d,

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left(\sum_{s\le t} f(Y_{s-}, Y_s)\right) = \mathbf{E}_x\left(\int_0^t \int_{D_\partial} f(Y_s, y) N(Y_s, dy) dH_s\right)$$

for every $x \in D$ (see [37] for details). We let $\mu_H(dx)$ be the Revuz measure for H.

Definition 4.2 *Suppose F is a bounded function on $D \times D$ vanishing on the diagonal. Let*

$$\mu_{|F|}(dx) := \left(\int_D |F(x,y)| N(x, dy)\right) \mu_H(dx).$$

(1) F is said to be in the class $\mathbf{A}_\infty(Y)$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are a Borel subset $K = K(\varepsilon)$ of finite $\mu_{|F|}$-measure and a constant $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(x,w)\in(D\times D)\setminus\{x=w\}} \int_{(D\times D)\setminus(K\times K)} G(x,y)\frac{|F(y,z)| G(z,w)}{G(x,w)} N(y,dz)\mu_H(dy) \le \varepsilon$$

and that, for all measurable sets $B \subset K$ with $\mu_{|F|}(B) < \delta$,

$$\sup_{(x,w)\in(D\times D)\setminus\{x=w\}} \int_{(B\times D)\cup(D\times B)} G(x,y)\frac{|F(y,z)| G(z,w)}{G(x,w)} N(y,dz)\mu_H(dy) \le \varepsilon.$$

(2) F is said to be in the class $\mathbf{A}_2(Y)$ if $F \in \mathbf{A}_\infty(Y)$ and if the measure $\mu_{|F|}$ is in $\mathbf{S}_\infty(Y)$.

By (2.4), Lévy system (N^D, H^D) for symmetric stable process X^D can be chosen to be

$$N^D(x, dy) = 2J(x,y)dy = \frac{\mathcal{A}(d, -\alpha)}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}} dy \quad \text{in } D \qquad \text{and} \qquad H_t^D = t, \tag{4.2}$$

where $J(x,y)$ is given in (2.2). By (4.1), the Revuz measure $\mu_{H^D}(dx)$ for H^D is simply the Lebesgue measure dx on D. (see Theorem 4.5.2, Theorem 4.6.1, Lemmas 5.3.1–5.3.3 and Theorem A.3.21 in [21] for the relation between (regular) Dirichlet form and Lévy system.)

Using the generalized 3G theorem (Theorem 1.1), now we can give a concrete condition for a function F to be in class $\mathbf{A}_2(X^D)$ on any bounded κ-fat open set D. For $w \in D$, We denote by $\mathbf{E}_x^w$ the expectation for the conditional process obtained from X^D through Doob's h-transform with $h(\cdot) = G_D(\cdot, w)$ starting from $x \in D$.

Theorem 4.3 *If D is a bounded κ-fat open set and F is a function on $D \times D$ with*

$$|F(x,y)| \le c|x-y|^\beta \tag{4.3}$$

for some $\beta > \alpha$ and $c > 0$, then $F \in \mathbf{A}_2(X^D)$ and

$$\sup_{(x,w)\in D\times D} \mathbf{E}_x^w \left[\sum_{s<\tau_D} F(X^D_{s-}, X^D_s) \right] < \infty. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. First let us show that $F \in \mathbf{A}_\infty$. Since D is bounded, by the Generalized 3G theorem (Theorem 1.1), there exists a positive constant $c = c(D, \alpha)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \\
&\le c \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} + \frac{1}{|z-w|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} + \frac{|y-z|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{|y-z|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{|y-z|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{|y-z|^{d-\alpha+2\gamma}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}|z-w|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Thus, by the assumption on F, (4.3), and (4.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{G_D(x,y)|F(y,z)|G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \frac{N^D(y,dz)}{dz} \le c\, \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \frac{1}{|y-z|^{d+\alpha-\beta}} \\
&\le c \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}|y-z|^{d+\alpha-\beta}} + \frac{1}{|y-z|^{d+\alpha-\beta}|z-w|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|y-z|^{2\alpha-\beta}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|y-z|^{2\alpha-\beta-\gamma}|z-w|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}|y-z|^{2\alpha-\beta-\gamma}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}|y-z|^{2\alpha-\beta-2\gamma}|z-w|^{d-\alpha+\gamma}} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Since $\gamma < \alpha < \beta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{(y,z) \mapsto |x-y|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|y-z|^{\beta-\alpha-d},\ x \in D\}, \\
&\{(y,z) \mapsto |z-w|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|y-z|^{\beta-\alpha-d},\ w \in D\}
\end{aligned}$$

are uniformly integrable over cylindrical sets of the form $B \times D$ and $D \times B$, for any Borel set $B \subset D$.

Now let us show that the following family of functions are uniformly integrable over cylindrical sets of the form $B \times D$ and $D \times B$:

$$\{(y,z) \mapsto |x-y|^{\alpha-d}|z-w|^{\alpha-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha},\ x,w \in D\}, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\{(y,z) \mapsto |x-y|^{\alpha-d}|z-w|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha+\gamma},\ x,w \in D\}, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\{(y,z) \mapsto |x-y|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|z-w|^{\alpha-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha+\gamma},\ x,w \in D\}, \tag{4.9}$$

$$\{(y,z) \mapsto |x-y|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|z-w|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha+2\gamma},\ x,w \in D\}. \tag{4.10}$$

We apply Young's inequality $ab \le \frac{1}{p}a^p + \frac{1}{q}b^q$ for some $p, q > 1$ satisfying

$$p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1. \tag{4.11}$$

1. First, let us consider the function (4.7) when the exponent of $|y-z|$ is negative, i.e., $\beta < 2\alpha$. Otherwise it is obvious that the function (4.7) is uniformly integrable since D is bounded. Applying Young's Inequality, we obtain

   $$\begin{aligned}&|x-y|^{\alpha-d}|z-w|^{\alpha-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha} = \big(|x-y||z-w|\big)^{\alpha-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha}\\ &\le \frac{1}{p}\Big(|x-y||z-w|\Big)^{(\alpha-d)p} + \frac{1}{q}|y-z|^{(\beta-2\alpha)q}.\end{aligned}$$

   It suffices to find $p, q > 1$ satisfying (4.11) and

   $$(d-\alpha)p < d, \quad (2\alpha-\beta)q < d. \tag{4.12}$$

   Choosing p in the interval

   $$\left(1 \vee \frac{d}{d-2\alpha+\beta}\right) < p < \frac{d}{d-\alpha},$$

   we can finish this case. Note that this interval is not empty since $\dfrac{d}{d-2\alpha+\beta} < \dfrac{d}{d-\alpha}$ by $\beta \wedge d > \alpha$ and $\dfrac{d}{d-\alpha} > 1$.

2. For the function (4.10), we replace α by $\alpha-\gamma$ in the previous case. Here note that $0 < \alpha-\gamma < \beta \wedge d$.

3. Now let us consider the function (4.8) only when the exponent of $|y-z|$ is negative, i.e., $\beta+\gamma < 2\alpha$.

   $$\begin{aligned}&|x-y|^{\alpha-d}|z-w|^{\alpha-\gamma-d}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha+\gamma}\\ &= (|x-y||z-w|)^{\alpha-d}\left(|z-w|^{-\gamma}|y-z|^{\beta-2\alpha+\gamma}\right)\\ &\le \frac{1}{p}\Big(|x-y||z-w|\Big)^{(\alpha-d)p} + \frac{1}{q}|z-w|^{-\gamma q}|y-z|^{(\beta-2\alpha+\gamma)q}.\end{aligned}$$

   We find $p, q > 1$ satisfying (4.11) and

   $$(d-\alpha)p < d, \quad \gamma q < d, \quad (2\alpha-\beta-\gamma)q < d. \tag{4.13}$$

   Choose p in the interval

   $$\left(1 \vee \frac{d}{d-\gamma} \vee \frac{d}{d-2\alpha+\beta+\gamma}\right) < p < \frac{d}{d-\alpha}.$$

   This interval is not empty. Clearly, $\dfrac{d}{d-\alpha} > 1$. Also, $\dfrac{d}{d-\alpha} > \dfrac{d}{d-\gamma}$ since $0 < \gamma < \alpha < d$. Finally, $\dfrac{d}{d-\alpha} > \dfrac{d}{d-2\alpha+\beta+\gamma}$ since $d > \alpha > \alpha-(\beta-\alpha)-\gamma = 2\alpha-\beta-\gamma$, $\alpha < \beta$.

4. Analogously to the previous case, the function (4.9) can be considered.

Thus F is in $\mathbf{A}_\infty(X^D)$ and, moreover,

$$\sup_{(x,w)\in D\times D}\int_D\int_D \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)}F(y,z)|y-z|^{-d-\alpha}dydz \,<\, \infty.$$

Note that, by Proposition 3.3 in [13] and (4.2),

$$\mathbf{E}_x^w\left[\sum_{s<\tau_D}F(X_{s-}^D,X_s^D)\right] = \mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)\int_D\int_D \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)}F(y,z)|y-z|^{-d-\alpha}dydz.$$

Therefore we have (4.4).

Since

$$\mu_{|F|}(dx) = \mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)\left(\int_D |F(x,y)||x-y|^{-\alpha-d}dy\right)dx \le \left(\int_D c\,|x-y|^{\beta-\alpha-d}dy\right)dx \le c\,dx,$$

it follows from (4.5) with $y=z$ that $\mu_{|F|}\in\mathbf{S}_\infty(X^D)$ and therefore F is in $\mathbf{A}_2(X^D)$. □

Fix $x_0\in D$ and set

$$M_D(x,y) := \frac{G_D(x,y)}{G_D(x_0,y)}\ , \qquad x,y\in D.$$

It is shown in [38] that

$$M_D(x,z) := \lim_{y\to z\in\partial D} M_D(x,y) \quad \text{exists for every } z\in\partial D, \tag{4.14}$$

which is called the Martin kernel of D, and that $M_D(x,z)$ is jointly continuous in $D\times\partial D$. For each $z\in\partial D$, set $M_D(x,z)=0$ for $x\in D^c$. For each $z\in\partial D$, $x\mapsto M_D(x,z)$ is a singular harmonic function for X in D (see pages 415-416 of [38] for details). We get the following as a corollary of the generalized 3G-inequality.

Corollary 4.4 *For every $x,y,z\in D$ and $w\in\partial D$, there exists a constant $c=c(D,\alpha)>0$ such that*

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)M_D(z,w)}{M_D(x,w)} \le c\left(\frac{|x-w|\wedge|y-z|}{|x-y|}\vee 1\right)^\gamma\left(\frac{|x-w|\wedge|y-z|}{|z-w|}\vee 1\right)^\gamma \frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}. \tag{4.15}$$

Let $H^+(X^D)$ be the collection of all positive singular harmonic function of X in D. We denote $\mathbf{E}_x^h$ the expectation for the conditional process obtained from X^D through Doob's h-transform with $h(\cdot)$ starting from $x\in D$. i.e.,

$$\mathbf{E}_x^h\left[f(X_t^D)\right] \,=\, \mathbf{E}_x\left[\frac{h(X_t^D)}{h(x)}f(X_t^D)\right].$$

When $h(\cdot) = M_D(\cdot, w)$ with $w \in \partial D$, we use $\mathbf{E}_x^w$ instead of $\mathbf{E}_x^{M_D(\cdot,w)}$.

The next result can be proved easily with an argument similar to the argument in the proof of Proposition 3.3 in [16]. We put the details for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 4.5 *For every $\beta > \alpha$,*

$$\sup_{x\in D, h\in H^+(X^D)} \mathbf{E}_x^h \left[\sum_{s<\tau_D} |X_{s-}^D - X_s^D|^\beta \right] < \infty. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. For every $h \in H^+(X^D)$, $M_t := h(X_s^D)/h(X_0^D)$ is a supermartingale multiplicative functional of X^D. It follows from Section 62 of [37] that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}_x^h \left[\sum_{s\le t} |X_{s-}^D - X_s^D|^\beta \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{s\le t} |X_{s-}^D - X_s^D|^\beta \left(\int_0^{\tau_D} 1_{\{s<r\le\tau_D\}} d(-M_r) + M_{\tau_D} \right); \, t < \tau_D \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{s\le t} |X_{s-}^D - X_s^D|^\beta M_s; \, t < \tau_D \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{h(x)} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{s\le t} |X_{s-}^D - X_s^D|^\beta h(X_s^D); \, t < \tau_D \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{h(x)} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\int_0^t \int_D |X_s^D - y|^\beta h(y) N^D(X_s^D, dy) dH_s^D \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by (4.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_x^h \left[\sum_{s<\tau_D} |X_{s-}^D - X_s^D|^\beta \right] &= \frac{1}{h(x)} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau_D} \int_D |X_s^D - y|^\beta h(y) N^D(X_s^D, dy) dH_s^D \right] \\
&= \mathcal{A}(d, -\alpha) \int_D \int_D \frac{G_D(x,y)h(z)}{h(x)} |y-z|^{-d-\alpha+\beta} dy dz. \qquad (4.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that since, by Corollary 4.4,

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)M_D(z,w)}{M_D(x,w)} |y-z|^{-d-\alpha+\beta}$$

is bounded above by (4.6), following the argument in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we get

$$\sup_{(x,w)\in D\times\partial D} \int_D \int_D \frac{G_D(x,y)M_D(z,w)}{M_D(x,w)} |y-z|^{-d-\alpha+\beta} dy dz < \infty. \tag{4.18}$$

Thus (4.18) and (4.17) with $h(\cdot) = M_D(\cdot, w)$ imply that

$$\sup_{(x,w)\in D\times\partial D} \mathbf{E}_x^w \left[\sum_{s<\tau_D} |X^D_{s-} - X^D_s|^\beta \right] \,<\, \infty. \tag{4.19}$$

On the other hand, from the Martin representation ((4.1) in [38]), for every $h \in H^+(X^D)$, there exists a finite measure μ on ∂D such that $h(x) = \int_{\partial D} M_D(x,w)\mu(dw)$. Thus by (4.17) and (4.19),

$$\begin{aligned} h(x)\mathbf{E}_x^h \left[\sum_{s<\tau_D} |X^D_{s-} - X^D_s|^\beta \right] &= \int_{\partial D} M_D(x,w)\mathbf{E}_x^w \left[\sum_{s<\tau_D} |X^D_{s-} - X^D_s|^\beta \right] \mu(dw) \\ &\le c \int_{\partial D} M_D(x,w)\mu(dw) \,=\, c\,h(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < h(x) < \infty$, we have (4.16). □

For the remainder of this section, we will discuss some properties of relativistic α-stable process in bounded κ-fat open sets. This process have been studied in [11, 14, 27, 35]. We will recall the definition of relativistic α-stable process and its basic properties. We will spell out some of the details for the readers, who are unfamiliar with the non-local Feynman-Kac perturbations (cf. [8, 13, 11]).

For $0 < \alpha < 2$, a relativistic α-stable process X^m in $\mathbf{R}^d$ is a Lévy process whose characteristic function is given by

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\exp\left(i\xi\cdot(X^m_t - X^m_0)\right)\right] = \exp\left(-t\left((|\xi|^2 + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m\right)\right), \quad \xi \in \mathbf{R}^d,$$

where $m > 0$ is a constant. In other words, the relativistic α-stable process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ has infinitesimal generator $m - (-\Delta + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2}$. It is clear that X^m is symmetric with respect to the Lebesgue measure dx on $\mathbf{R}^d$ and that when the parameter m degenerates to 0, X^m becomes a symmetric α-stable process X on $\mathbf{R}^d$.

The Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{Q}, D(\mathcal{Q}))$ of X^m is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}(u,v) := \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \hat{v}(\xi)\bar{\hat{u}}(\xi)\left((|\xi|^2 + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m\right) d\xi$$

and

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^d) : \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |\hat{u}(\xi)|^2 \left((|\xi|^2 + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m\right) d\xi < \infty\}.$$

where $\hat{u}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-d/2}\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot y}u(y)dy$ (see Example 1.4.1 of [21]). Recall $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ from (2.1). Similar to $\mathcal{E}_1$, we can also define $\mathcal{Q}_1$. From (2.1), we see that there exist positive constants $c_1 = c_1(m)$ and $c_2 = c_2(m)$ such that

$$c_1\mathcal{E}_1(u,u) \le \mathcal{Q}_1(u,u) \le c_2\mathcal{E}_1(u,u). \tag{4.20}$$

Therefore $D(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{F}$. From now on we will use $\mathcal{F}$ instead of $D(\mathcal{Q})$.

Like symmetric stable processes, relativistic α-stable processes can be obtained from Brownian motions through subordinations. For the details, we refer our readers to [35]. By Lemma 2 in [35], the Lévy measure for relativistic α-stable process has the density

$$\nu(x) := \frac{\alpha}{2\Gamma(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})} \int_0^\infty (4\pi u)^{-d/2} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4u}} e^{-m^{2/\alpha}} u^{-(1+\frac{\alpha}{2})} du.$$

Using change of variables twice, first with $u = |x|^2 v$ then with $v = 1/s$, we get

$$\nu(x) = \mathcal{A}(d,\, -\alpha)|x|^{-d-\alpha}\psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x|)$$

where

$$\psi(r) := 2^{-(d+\alpha)}\,\Gamma\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right)^{-1} \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{s}{4}-\frac{r^2}{s}}\, ds,$$

which is a smooth function of r^2 (see pages 276-277 of [14] for the details). Recall $J(x,y)$ from (2.2). The Lévy measure $\nu(x)dx$ determines the jumping measure J^m of X^m:

$$J^m(x,y) := \frac{1}{2}\nu(x-y) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(d,\, -\alpha)|x-y|^{-d-\alpha}\psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x-y|) = J(x,y)\psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x-y|)$$

Thus the Dirichlet form $\mathcal{Q}$ of X^m can also be written as follows

$$\mathcal{Q}(u,v) \;=\; \int_{\mathbf{R}^d}\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))J^m(x,y)dxdy.$$

For a bounded κ-fat open set D, let $X^{m,D}$ be killed relativistic stable process in D with parameter $m > 0$. From (4.20), we have that the Dirichlet form of $X^{m,D}$ is $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}^D)$, where $\mathcal{F}^D$ is given in (2.3). For any $u, v \in \mathcal{F}^D$,

$$\mathcal{Q}(u,v) = \int_D\int_D (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))J^m(x,y)dxdy + \int_D u(x)v(x)\kappa_D^m(x)dx, \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$\kappa_D^m(x) := 2\int_{D^c} J^m(x,y)dy = \mathcal{A}(d,\, -\alpha)\int_{D^c} |x-y|^{-d-\alpha}\psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x-y|)dy. \tag{4.22}$$

Let

$$F^m(x,y) := \frac{J^m(x,y)}{J(x,y)} - 1 = \psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x-y|) - 1$$

and with $\kappa_D(x)$ given in (2.5)

$$q^m(x) := \kappa_D^m(x) - \kappa_D(x) = \mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha)\int_{D^c} F^m(x,y)|x-y|^{-d-\alpha}dy.$$

Since $\psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x-y|)$ is a positive continuous function and D is bounded, $\inf_{x,y\in D} F^m(x,y) > -1$. We know that $\psi(r)$ is a smooth function of r^2 and $\psi(0) = 1$. Thus, there exists a constant $c = c(D,\alpha,m) > 0$ such that

$$|F^m(x,y)| \le c\,|x-y|^2, \qquad \text{for } x, y \in D. \tag{4.23}$$

Thus by Theorem 4.3,

$$F^m \in \mathbf{A}_2(X^D) \quad \text{and} \quad \ln(1+F^m) \in \mathbf{A}_\infty(X^D). \tag{4.24}$$

Moreover, by (4.23),

$$q^m(x) \le c_1 \int_{D^c} |x-y|^{-d-\alpha+2} dy \le c_2 \rho_D(x)^{2-\alpha}, \quad x \in D.$$

So using the 3G theorem, $q^m \in S_\infty(X^D)$.

Let

$$K_t^m := \exp\left(\sum_{0<s\le t} \ln(1+F^m(X_{s-}^D, X_s^D)) - \mathcal{A}(d,-\alpha) \int_0^t \int_D F^m(X_s^D, y)|X_s^D - y|^{-d-\alpha} dy ds \right.$$
$$\left. - \int_0^t q^m(X_s^D) ds \right).$$

Using the multiplicative functional K_t^m, we define a semigroup Q_t^m;

$$Q_t^m f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x \left[f(X_t^D) K_t^m \right], \quad x \in D.$$

Then by Theorem 4.8 of [13], Q_t^m is a strongly continuous semigroup in $L^2(D, dx)$ whose associated quadratic form is $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{F}^D)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(u,v) &= \int_D \int_D (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))(1+F^m(x,y))J(x,y) dx dy \\
&\quad + \int_D u(x)v(x)\kappa_D(x) dx + \int_D u(x)v(x)q^m(x) dx \\
&= \int_D \int_D (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))J^m(x,y) dx dy + \int_D u(x)v(x)\kappa_D^m(x) dx
\end{aligned}$$

for u, v in $\mathcal{F}^D$. Thus by (4.21), the quadratic form associated with Q_t^m is exactly the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}^D)$ of $X^{m,D}$. Therefore X^m can be obtained from X through the Feynman-Kac transform K_t^m. That is,

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left[f(X_t^{m,D}) \right] = \mathbf{E}_x \left[f(X_t^D) K_t^m \right]$$

for every positive Borel measurable function f. Since $X^{m,D}$ is transient (for example, see Theorem 3.2 in [14]), by Theorem 3.10 in [8], we get the following theorem, which extends Theorem 3.1 in [14].

Theorem 4.6 *There exists Green function $V_D(x,y)$ for X^m in D, jointly continuous on $D \times D$ except along the diagonal, such that*

$$\int_D V_D(x,y) f(y) dy = \mathbf{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau_D} f(X_s^m) ds \right]$$

for every Borel function $f \geq 0$ on D. Moreover, there exists a positive constant $c = c(m, \alpha, D)$ such that

$$c^{-1}\, G_D(x,y) \;\leq\; V_D(x,y) \;\leq\; c\, G_D(x,y), \quad x, y \in D,$$

and for every $x, y, z, w \in D$

$$\frac{V_D(x,y)V_D(z,w)}{V_D(x,w)} \leq c \left(\frac{|x-w| \wedge |y-z|}{|x-y|} \vee 1 \right)^{\gamma} \left(\frac{|x-w| \wedge |y-z|}{|z-w|} \vee 1 \right)^{\gamma} \frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}. \tag{4.25}$$

Since the jump measure of X^m is $\frac{1}{2}v(x-y)$, we see that Lévy system (N^m, H^m) for $X^{m,D}$ can be chosen to be

$$N^m(x, dy) = 2J^m(x,y)dy = \frac{\mathcal{A}(d, -\alpha)\psi(m^{1/\alpha}|x-y|)}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}} dy \quad \text{in } D \qquad \text{and} \quad H_t^m = t \tag{4.26}$$

and the Revuz measure $\mu_{H^m}(dx)$ for H^m is simply the Lebesgue measure dx on D (cf. [21]). Thus

$$N^m(x, dy) \leq N^D(x, dy) \quad \text{ in } D. \tag{4.27}$$

Theorem 4.7 *If D is a bounded κ-fat open set and F is a function on $D \times D$ with $|F(x,y)| \leq c|x-y|^{\beta}$ for some $\beta > \alpha$ and $c > 0$, then $F \in \mathbf{A}_2(X^{m,D})$ and*

$$\sup_{(x,w) \in D \times D} \mathbf{E}_x^w \left[\sum_{s < \tau_D} F(X_{s-}^{m,D}, X_s^{m,D}) \right] < \infty.$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.6 and (4.27), $G_D(x,y)G_D(z,w)/G_D(x,w)$ is bounded above by (4.5). So by (4.27),

$$\frac{G_D(x,y)|F(y,z)|G_D(z,w)}{G_D(x,w)} \frac{N^m(y,dz)}{dz}$$

is bounded above by (4.6). Now following the remainder argument in Theorem 4.3, we get the result. □

In Chen and Kim [11], an integral representation of nonnegative excessive functions for the Schrödinger operator is established. Moreover it is shown that the Martin boundary is stable under non-local Feynman-Kac perturbation. As mentioned in section 6 of [11], the method in [11] works for a large class of strong Markov processes having a dual process. In particular, Theorem 3.4 (3) [11] is true for symmetric stable processes in bounded κ-fat open sets. Applying Theorems 3.4 and 5.16 in [11] to symmetric stable and relativistic stable processes in bounded κ-fat open sets, we have the following from our Theorem 4.6.

Theorem 4.8 *For every $x \in D$ and $w \in \partial D$, $K(x,w) := \lim_{y \to w, y \in D} \frac{V_D(x,y)}{V_D(x_0,y)}$ exists and is finite. It is jointly continuous on $D \times \partial D$. Moreover, there exists a positive constant c such that*

$$c^{-1} M_D(x,w) \leq K_D(x,w) \leq c\, M_D(x,w), \quad x \in D, w \in \partial D,$$

and for every $x, y, z, w \in D$

$$\frac{V_D(x,y)K_D(z,w)}{K_D(x,w)} \leq c \left(\frac{|x-w| \wedge |y-z|}{|x-y|} \vee 1 \right)^{\gamma} \left(\frac{|x-w| \wedge |y-z|}{|z-w|} \vee 1 \right)^{\gamma} \frac{|x-w|^{d-\alpha}}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}|z-w|^{d-\alpha}}. \tag{4.28}$$

Theorem 4.9 *For every singular positive harmonic function u for X^m in D, there is a unique finite measure ν on ∂D such that*

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial D} K_D(x,z)\nu(dz). \tag{4.29}$$

Thus the Martin boundary and the minimal Martin boundary for relativistic α-stable process X^m in D can all be identified with the Euclidean boundary ∂D of D.

When u is singular harmonic in D for X^m, the measure ν in (4.29) is called the Martin measure of u. Let $H^+(X^{m,D})$ be the collection of all positive singular harmonic function of X^m in D. We denote $\mathbf{E}_x^h$ the expectation for the conditional process obtained from $X^{m,D}$ through Doob's h-transform with $h(\cdot)$ starting from $x \in D$.

Proposition 4.10 *For every $\beta > \alpha$,*

$$\sup_{x \in D, h \in H^+(X^{m,D})} \mathbf{E}_x^h \left[\sum_{s < \tau_D} |X_{s-}^{m,D} - X_s^{m,D}|^{\beta} \right] < \infty. \tag{4.30}$$

Proof. Using Theorem 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9, the proof is almost identical to the proof of Proposition 4.5. So we skip the proof here. □

The boundary behavior of harmonic functions under non-local Feynman-Kac perturbations has been studied by the first named author [27, 28]. In [28], it is proven that the ratio u/h of two singular harmonic functions for X^m in an bounded $C^{1,1}$-open set has non-tangential limits almost everywhere with respect to the Martin measure of h. Due to (4.24), now we can apply Theorem 4.7 in [28] to X^m in bounded κ-fat open sets and extend the result in Theorem 4.11 [28].

Recall the Stolz open set for κ-fat open set D from [28]; For $Q \in \partial D$ and $\beta > (1-\kappa)/\kappa$, let

$$A_Q^{\beta} := \{ y \in D;\ |y - Q| < \beta \rho_D(y) \}.$$

Theorem 4.11 *Suppose D is a bounded κ-fat open set. If k and u are singular harmonic functions for X^m in D and ν the Martin measure for k. Then for ν-a.e. $Q \in \partial D$,*

$$\lim_{A_Q^{\beta} \ni x \to Q} \frac{u(x)}{k(x)} \quad \textit{exists for every } \beta > \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa}.$$

5 Extension

As we mentioned in the introduction of this paper, to keep our exposition as transparent as possible, we have chosen rotationally invariant symmetric α-stable process to present our result. However our approach works for a large class of symmetric Markov processes. We have not attempted to find the most general condition where generalized 3G theorem is true. However we like to point out that the generalized 3G theorem extends to any symmetric Markov processes satisfying the conditions below. We put these in terms of Green function $G_D(x,y)$.

There exist positive constants r_0, γ, M and c_0 such that the following holds:

(C1) (Lemma 3.1) For all $Q \in \partial D$ and $r \in (0, r_0)$, we have

$$G_D(A_s(Q), z_0) \geq c_0 (s/r)^\gamma G_D(A_r(Q), z_0), \qquad s \in (0, r).$$

(C2) (Theorem 2.2) Let $y, x_1, x_2 \in D$ and $x_1, x_2 \in D \setminus B(y, \rho_D(y)/2)$ such that $|x_1 - x_2| < L(\rho_D(x_1) \wedge \rho_D(x_2))$. Then there exists a constant $c := c(L)$ such that $G_D(x_2, y) \leq cG_D(x_1, y)$.

(C3) $G_D(x,y) \leq c_0|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}$ and $G_D(x,y) \geq c_0^{-1}|x-y|^{-d+\alpha}$ if $|x-y| \leq \rho_D(y)/2$.

(C4) (Lemma 3.2) For every $Q \in \partial D$ and $r \in (0, r_0)$, we have for $x, y \in D \setminus B(Q, r)$ and $z_1, z_2 \in D \cap B(Q, r/M)$

$$\frac{G_D(x, z_1)}{G_D(y, z_1)} \leq c \frac{G_D(x, z_2)}{G_D(y, z_2)}.$$

It is well-known that (C2)-(C4) implies Green function estimates (Theorem 3.4) (for example, see [22] for a similar setup and the conditions equivalent to the condition (C4)). Under the above conditions (C1)-(C4), all the results in Sections 3 hold through the same argument.

Moreover, if the symmetric Markov process is a stable (Lévy) process, we know from the proof of Lemma 3.1 that (3.2) implies (C1) with $\gamma < \alpha$.

In the remainder of this section, we discuss the generalized 3G theorem for another type of jump processes. Recently a class of (not necessarily rotationally invariant) symmetric α-stable Lévy process was studied in [6] and [39]. Let σ be the surface measure on $\partial B(0,1) = \{|y| = 1\}$. For any $\alpha \in (0,2)$, α-stable Lévy process $Z = (Z_t, \mathbf{P}_x)$ is a symmetric Lévy process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\exp(i\xi \cdot (Z_t - Z_0))\right] = \exp(-t\Phi(\xi)) \qquad \text{for every } x \in \mathbf{R}^d \text{ and } \xi \in \mathbf{R}^d.$$

where

$$\Phi(\xi) := \int_{\{|y|=1\}} |y \cdot \xi|^\alpha f(y) \sigma(dy) \tag{5.1}$$

and f is a symmetric function on $\{|y| = 1\}$ with $0 < c_1^{-1} \leq f \leq c_1 < \infty$. When $f \equiv c$ for some appropriate constant, Z is a rotationally invariant symmetric α-stable process X, which we considered in Sections 2–3 (see [6] and [39] for details).

Recall that a bounded domain D is said to be Lipschitz if there is a localization radius $r > 0$ and a constant $\Lambda > 0$ such that for every $Q \in \partial D$, there is a Lipschitz function $\phi_Q : \mathbf{R}^{d-1} \to \mathbf{R}$ satisfying $\phi_Q(0) = 0$, $|\phi_Q(x) - \phi_Q(z)| \leq \Lambda|x - z|$, and an orthonormal coordinate system $y = (y_1, \cdots, y_{d-1}, y_d) := (\tilde{y}, y_d)$ such that $B(Q, r) \cap D = B(Q, r) \cap \{y : y_d > \phi_Q(\tilde{y})\}$. It is easy to see that D is κ-fat with characteristics (r, κ) with $\kappa = (2\sqrt{1 + \Lambda^2})^{-1}$.

¿From [39], we see that, if D is a bounded Lipschitz, the conditions (C2)–(C4) are true (see (2.3)–(2.4), Lemma 3.3–3.4 and Theorem 4.2 in [39]). Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 in [6], the condition (C1) is true with $\gamma < \alpha$. Thus we have the generalized 3G theorem for Z.

Theorem 5.1 *If Z is symmetric α-stable Lévy process and D is bounded Lipschitz, the inequality (1.3) is true with some* $0 < \gamma < \alpha$.

Since the density of the Lévy measure for Z is comparable to $|x|^{-d-\alpha}$ ((2.1) in [39]), we have the following theorem. The argument of the proof is the same as the ones in the proofs of Theorems 4.3 and 4.7. So we skip the proof.

Theorem 5.2 *Suppose Z is symmetric α-stable Lévy process and D is bounded Lipschitz. If F is a function on $D \times D$ with $|F(x, y)| \leq c|x - y|^\beta$ for some $\beta > \alpha$ and $c > 0$, then $F \in \mathbf{A}_2(Z^D)$ and*

$$\sup_{(x,w) \in D \times D} \mathbf{E}_x^w \left[\sum_{s < \tau_D} F(Z^D_{s-}, Z^D_s) \right] < \infty.$$

Acknowledgment: The first named author of this paper thanks Professor Renming Song and Professor Zhen-Qing Chen for their encouragement and their helpful comments on the first version of this paper.

References

[1] H, Aikawa and T. Lundh, The 3G inequality for a uniformly John domain. *Kodai Math. J.* **28(2)** (2005), 209–219.

[2] R. F. Bass and K. Burdzy, Conditioned Brownian motion in planar domains. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **101(4)** (1995), 479–493.

[3] K. Bogdan, The boundary Harnack principle for the fractional Laplacian. *Studia Math.* **123(1)**(1997), 43–80.

[4] K. Bogdan, Sharp estimates for the Green function in Lipschitz domains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **243** (2000), 326-337.

[5] K. Bogdan and T. Byczkowski, Potential theory for the α-stable Schödinger operator on bounded Lipschitz domains. *Studia Math.* **133(1)** (1999), 53–92.

[6] K. Bogdan, A. Stos and P. Sztonyk, Potential theory for Lévy stable processes, *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math.*, **50**(2002), 361–372.

[7] R. Carmona, W. C. Masters, B. Simon, Relativistic Schrödinger operators: asymptotic behavior of the eigenfunctions. *J. Funct. Anal.* **91(1)** (1990), 117–142.

[8] Z.-Q. Chen, Gaugeability and conditional gaugeability. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354** (2002), 4639–4679.

[9] Z.-Q. Chen, Multidimensional symmetric stable processes. *Korean J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **6(2)** (1999), 227–266.

[10] Z.-Q. Chen and P. Kim, Green function estimate for censored stable processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **124** (2002), 595-610.

[11] Z.-Q. Chen and P. Kim, Stability of Martin boundary under non-local Feynman-Kac perturbations. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **128** (2004), 525-564.

[12] Z.-Q. Chen, A note on the Green function estimates for symmetric stable processes. *Recent developments in stochastic analysis and related topics*, 125–135, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2004.

[13] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song, Conditional gauge theorem for non-local Feynman-Kac transforms. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **125** (2003), 45-72.

[14] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song, Drift transforms and Green function estimates for discontinuous processes. *J. Funct. Anal.* **201** (2003), 262-281.

[15] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song, Estimates on Green functions and Poisson kernels of symmetric stable processes. *Math. Ann.*, **312** (1998), 465–601.

[16] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song, General gauge and conditional gauge theorems. *Ann. Probab.* **30** (2002), 1313-1339.

[17] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song, Intrinsic ultracontractivity and conditional gauge for symmetric stable processes. *J. Funct. Anal.* **150** (1997), 204–239.

[18] K. L. Chung and Z. X. Zhao, *From Brownian motion to Schrödinger's equation*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[19] M. Cranston, E. Fabes and Z. Zhao, Conditional gauge and potential theory for the Schro"dinger operator. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **307(1)** (1988), 171–194.

[20] C. Fefferman and R. de la Llave, Relativistic stability of matter-I, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **2** (1986), 119–213.

[21] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima and M. Takeda, *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, Walter De Gruyter, Berlin, 1994.

[22] W. Hansen, Uniform boundary Harnack principle and generalized triangle property. *J. Funct. Anal.* **226(2)**, (2005), 452–484

[23] I. W. Herbst, Spectral theory of the operator $(p^2+m^2)^{1/2} - Ze^2/r$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **53(3)** (1977), 285–294.

[24] I. W. Herbst and Z. X. Zhao, Note on the $3G$ theorem ($d = 2$): "Green functions and conditioned gauge theorem for a 2-dimensional domain" [in Seminar on Stochastic Processes, 1987 (Princeton, NJ, 1987), 283–294, Birkha"user Boston, Boston, MA, 1988] by Zhao. *Seminar on Stochastic Processes*, (1988) 183–184, Birkha"user, Boston, 1989.

[25] T. Jakubowski, The estimates for the Green function in Lipschitz domains for the symmetric stable processes. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, **22(2)** (2002), 419–441.

[26] D. S. Jerison and C. E. Kenig, Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in non-tangentially accessible domains. *Adv. Math.*, **46** (1982), 80–147.

[27] P. Kim, Fatou's theorem for censored stable processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **108(1)** (2003), 63–92.

[28] P. Kim, Relative Fatou's theorem for $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$-harmonic function in κ-fat open set, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **234(1)** (2006), 70-105.

[29] P. Kim and R. Song, Potential theory of Truncated stable processes, Preprint, 2006

[30] P. Kim and R. Song, Estimates on Green functions and the Schrödinger-type equations for non-symmetric diffusions with measure-valued drifts, Preprint, 2006.

[31] T. Kulczycki and B. Siudeja, Intrinsic ultracontractivity of Feynman-Kac semigroup for relativistic stable processes, to appear in *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*

[32] E. H. Lieb, The stability of matter. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, **48(4)** (1976), 553–569.

[33] E. H. Lieb and H.-T. Yau, The stability and instability of relativistic matter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **118(2)** (1988), 177–213.

[34] O. Martio and M. Vuorinen, Whitney cubes, p-capacity, and Minkowski content. *Exposition. Math.*, **5(1)** (1987), 17–40.

[35] M. Ryznar, Estimates of Green function for relativistic α-stable process. *Potential Anal.*, **17(1)** (2002), 1–23.

[36] M. Selmi, Inequalities for Green functions in a Dini-Jordan domain in $\mathbf{R}^2$, *Potential Anal.*, **13(1)** (2000), 81–102.

[37] M. Sharpe, *General Theory of Markov Processes.* Academic Press, Inc. 1988.

[38] R. Song and J. Wu, Boundary Harnack principle for symmetric stable processes, *J. Funct. Anal.* 168(2) (1999), 403-427.

[39] P. Sztonyk, Boundary potential theory for stable Lévy processes, *Colloq. Math.*, **95**(2003), 191–206.

[40] Z. X. Zhao, Green functions and conditioned gauge theorem for a 2-dimensional domain, *Seminar on Stochastic Processes*, (1987) 283–294, Birkha"user, Boston, 1988.